

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application as filed.

The Drawings were objected to.

Claims 1, 3, 11, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 5, 7, and 14 were objected to.

Drawings

The Drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters:

- a. “462” and “482” have both been used to designate horizontal portion.
- b. “386” and “486” have both been used to designate connection portions.

On page 6, line 4 of the specification, “462” has been replaced by “482”. On page 6, line 13 of the specification, “386” has been replaced by “486”. The specification has been amended as described above to be coextensive with the Drawings as filed. The Drawings as filed are therefore in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4).

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of the following informality: there was no brief description of Figure 9B. On page 3, line 33, after 9A, “, 9B,” has been added by amendment to the specification. Therefore, a brief description of Figure 9B is now in the Brief Description of the Drawings and the aforementioned informality has been overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 7. Claim 7 has been cancelled. Therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 18, and the claims dependent therefrom, are now in allowable form. Allowable claim 5 has been rewritten as new independent claim 21. Independent claim 21 is in allowable form.

Claim 14 as filed is allowable since it overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph for the reasons set forth above. Independent claims 12 has been rewritten to include the

limitations of dependent claim 14 as filed. Claim 14 has therefore been cancelled. Amended independent claim 12 and the claims dependent therefrom are in allowable form.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3, 11, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3, and 11 as filed have been amended above so that they are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 14 as filed is not indefinite. The guiding blocks are movable either in an outward direction or in an inwardly direction. The language set forth in claim 14 describing the movement of the guiding blocks is correct as it appears.

New Claims

New claims 21-23 are added in the amendment.

Claim 21 is allowable as explained above.

Claim 22 recites each of the guiding blocks moves horizontally along the guiding lane within a range defined by a radius of the plate. This claim is supported in the Specification, for example, on page 5, line 22.

Shin et al., on the other hand, teaches guide blocks 22 that move up and down (col. 4 line 46), not a motion defined radially as in claim 22.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-23 of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Hosoon Lee
Reg. No. 56,737

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575